

**REMARKS**

Claim 1 has been amended to delete reference to formulas (I) and (VIII).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the "at least one electron transporting organic material is a compound represented by formula (X)." Support for formula (X) can be found at, for example, formula (X) as shown on page 22 and defined on page 22, lines 30-35 of the present specification. Support for R<sub>101</sub>-R<sub>103</sub> is found at, for example, page 17, lines 21-22 of the present specification. Support for the definition of a substituent is found at, for example, page 9, line 28 through page 11, line 15 of the present specification.

Claim 10 is canceled.

Upon entry of the Amendment, which is respectfully requested, claims 1, 4, 12 and 14-20 will be pending.

At Paragraph No. 3 of the Action, claim 10 is objected to because of an informality.

Namely, the Examiner alleges that claim 10 recites "said at least one electron transporting organic material is a compound represented by formula (IX) ..." which conflicts with claim 1, from which claim 10 depends, since claim 1 recites "said at least one electron transporting organic material is a compound represented by formula (VIII) ..." The Examiner asserts that formula (IX) is not a narrower version of formula (VIII), but rather that formula (VIII) contains features (linking groups L1-L3) that are not present in formula (IX).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 has been canceled, which renders this objection moot. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

At Paragraph No. 5, claims 1, 4, 10, 12, and 14-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Namely, the Examiner asserts that claim 1 recites the broad recitation, "said at least one electron transporting organic material is a compound represented by formula (I) ...", and the claim also recites, "said at least one electron transporting organic material is a compound represented by formula (VIII) ..." which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Applicant respectfully submit that both formulas (I) and formula (VIII) have been deleted from claim 1 such that this rejection is moot. Withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph, rejection is respectfully requested.

At Paragraph No. 11 of the Action, claims 1, 4, 10, 12, and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over "Petritsch" (U.S. Patent No. 6,340,789) in view of "Stossel" (U.S. Patent No. 7,223,484) as evidenced by "Asfandiarov" (Investigation of Electron Structure of 2,1,3-Benzothiadiazole Derivatives by Means of Negative Ion Mass Spectrometry, Photoelectron Spectroscopy and Absorption Spectroscopy; Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom. 12, 595-602, 1998), "Nakaya" (U.S. Patent No. 5,792,557), and Kimura (U.S. Patent No. 2003/0072965).

At Paragraph No. 39, claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Petritsch in view of Stossel as evidenced by Asfandiarov, Nakaya, and Kimura as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of "Iwasaki" (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0209651).

Applicant respectfully submits that present claim 1 and claims dependent thereon are non-obvious over the cited references, because no combination of the cited references appears to teach or suggest all of the recitations of present claim 1.

For example, Kimura does not disclose nor suggest the compound of formula (X), and the compound 21 used in Examples of the present specification which meets the formula (X) exhibited high quantum efficiency (unexpectedly superior results) as shown in the Tables 1 and 3 at page 67 and 71 of the present specification.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that present claim 1 and claims dependent thereon are non-obvious over the cited references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 obviousness rejections are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
Application No.: 10/593,960

Attorney Docket No.: Q97019

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce E. Kramer  
Registration No. 33,725

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

**65565**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 28, 2010